

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, District Judge:

At the conference held before the Court on December 8, 2007, the Court heard argument regarding plaintiff's request for a temporary restraining order and granted plaintiff's request to file an amended complaint in the above-entitled action. Subsequently, at the conference held before the Court on December 10, 2007, the Court adopted the following directives:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, for the reasons set forth on the record on December 8 and December 10, 2007, plaintiff's request for a temporary restraining order is DENIED. Specifically, the Court finds — upon review of plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, the supporting exhibits and declarations attached thereto, and the arguments presented by counsel at the two conferences before the Court — plaintiff has failed, at this early stage of the case, to demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits, or sufficiently serious questions going to the merits to make them a fair ground for litigation and a balance of hardships tipping decidedly in plaintiff's favor. See SmithKline Beecham Consumer Healthcare, L.P. v. Watson Pharm., Inc., 211 F.3d 21, 24 (2d Cir. 2000).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall abide by the following briefing schedule with regard to plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction:

Defendants' opposition shall be submitted by January 2, 2008.

Plaintiff's reply, if any, shall be submitted by January 9, 2008.

Thereafter, the Court will schedule a hearing regarding plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction, if necessary.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: New York, New York

December 16, 2007

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE